



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

vanity. *It is not from this motive* that the priests seek to return our members: they are too wise, and too well directed by their superiors, to pay such a price as this election has cost them for the mere vanity of showing their influence.

Only consider what it has cost them—in Meath, for instance. It is well known that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Meath, in speaking of the duty of electors, at a public dinner, in the town of Oldcastle, was told by a Roman Catholic gentleman, of station and influence, “that if that was the gospel that his lordship preached, the sooner they heard another gospel the better.” And when that gentleman retired from the table, several others rose up, and followed him. It is well known that another Roman Catholic gentleman has said, that the expression “surpliced ruffians” was coming true! It is well known that, in the chapel of Athboy, on Sunday, July 24th, when the priest preached on those who dared to vote for Grattan, five or six Roman Catholics, distinguished for their birth, their intelligence, or their influence, rose up, and left the chapel, and have said that they would not return to it. It is well known that *all* the influential Roman Catholics of Meath, and a great body of the middle class, are indignant and disgusted at the interference of the priests at that election.

This was too high a price to pay for mere vanity, and it was not for mere vanity that it was incurred. The state of Europe tells the object: the priesthood are everywhere grasping at political power, as their last resource. The Pope is kept upon his throne by foreign politics and foreign bayonets, and the Jesuits are everywhere striving for political power. It is so in Ireland, too. If the priesthood can return their own members, they become a political power in the country; and they feel that in their present critical position, the most desperate efforts must be made, the greatest dangers must be risked, to accomplish this last hope against an impending fall.

This is the great fact of the Irish elections, and we ask “Catholic laymen” to consider the principle it involves.

On that night when our Blessed Lord was about to found his kingdom in his own blood, he had occasion to correct his Apostles, for coveting for themselves that kind of power which political rulers possess; and he said to them—“The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that have power over them are called beneficent, but you not so.”—Luke xxii. 25, Douay Bible. They were not to covet nor to possess the power of temporal or political rulers.

That same night when Pilate asked him about his kingdom, he answered—“My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, my servants would certainly strive, that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but now my kingdom is not from hence.”—John xviii. 36. Political power is the power of the sword; because it rests upon the sword. In every country there are men who would overthrow the existing government of that country if they could, or if they dared. Any government that is not prepared to defend itself against such men by force will quickly perish. We happily do not see this so plain in England; but if we look over Europe, we see plainly that all political power depends on the sword for its support. But our Saviour says, there was to be nothing of the kind in his kingdom, because **HIS KINGDOM IS NOT OF THIS WORLD.** All political power exercised by Christ's ministers in that capacity, and by that title, is, therefore, at variance with the essential nature of Christ's kingdom upon earth.

We do not forget that clergymen are citizens too; and *in that capacity* may lawfully exercise their fair share of political power. Had the priests confined themselves to voting as electors

—had they confined themselves to using such persuasion with other electors as their superior intelligence might give them, we should not have had one word to say against it. But when they claim to have a right *in the character of priests of Christ, by that title, and in that capacity*, to overrule and govern the political conduct and political privileges of other men, then we say that, claiming to be priests of Christ, they are subverting the kingdom of Christ; they are confounding, and destroying, and denying its true and essential character; they are building up for themselves a kingdom of this world, which is not the kingdom of Christ; they thrust him from his kingly throne, to rule themselves in baser seats.

These directions of Christ concerning his kingdom may account for a fact which is proved by the experience of the world, however contrary it may be to any expectation which we might otherwise have formed—namely, that political power, in the hands of the ministers of Christ, has ever taken the form of the most oppressive and hopeless of human tyrannies. Men did, not unnaturally, expect that it would be otherwise. The world indulged a hope that they whose passions were regulated by a higher power, whose aims were directed to man's greatest good, whose minds were sanctified by a more immediate inspection of the Most High, would be more fit than any others to have the direction of this world, more likely to prove benefactors of mankind, than any others who could exercise authority upon them. And the expectation, perhaps, was natural. Yet it has ever been disappointed. We do not speak now only of the priests of Rome; we speak of the Primitive Church in its purest days, of the reformed Churches, of all Protestant sects, heretical or not, and we affirm, that the possession of political power, of the powers of this world, by any of them, has ever shown a constant tendency to degenerate rapidly into the worst form of tyranny.

We glory in the conviction that the Gospel has conferred the greatest political benefits on mankind. Even in our own days, we know that it has shown its mighty power in humanizing political institutions: it has abolished slavery in most Christian countries, and has well nigh abolished the slave trade from the face of the earth. But these things have ever been done when Christ's ministers assumed no political or earthly power to themselves.

Wherever they have sought to become what Christ warned them that they should not be—whenever they have attempted to turn his kingdom into a kingdom of this world, they have proved anything but benefactors to mankind.

We need look no farther for an instance than to Rome itself. There the experiment of Christ's ministers assuming to themselves the temporal and political power has had the fullest and the fairest trial, and the clearest result. The history of Rome, for centuries, has been, and now is at this day, one long-continued contest of tyranny on the one hand and rebellion on the other, which we ourselves have seen break out into the flames of civil war, and which we now see compressed by the most hateful tyranny that can oppress a nation—her own rulers supported by foreign bayonets, and resting upon them alone. But the Papal government, being infallible, is beyond repentance; and instead of now providing a free government for her Roman subjects, is seeking to grasp in her own hand the political rule of all other countries; and hence the scenes that we have witnessed at our Irish elections.

There is no remedy for this, but that our countrymen should learn that Christ declared that his ministers should not be so—that his kingdom should not be of this world. Let us learn to believe in the kingdom of Christ, not merely as it shall be hereafter in the world to

come, but as it now is in this present world. It is a kingdom that waxes strong, and confers blessings on man, by using no human powers, but trusting solely upon him who was its founder, and who alone can be its keeper and defence. But let it once stretch forth the arm of flesh for its own defence, and its inherent power is departed with its real character; then none but Christ himself can heal the wounds that arm of flesh inflicts; and we learn to curse the hand that dares to mix up what God has made distinct and separate.

In the spread of this true knowledge of the nature of Christ's kingdom upon earth, we place our only hope for the safety of our earthly kingdom. In proportion as the people learn this, the priests will have to acknowledge and submit to it in their conduct.

WE reprint the following able letter from the *Meath Herald*, as it seems to be written with a desire to avoid hurting the feelings of Roman Catholics, who are guiltless in the matter. We shall, of course, publish the answer when it appears.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. CANTWELL.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR—If a general election be often a time of passion and folly, it is often succeeded by a time of reflection and regret.

I have waited until the time of passion may be over, and the time of reflection come, to address you on an important question respecting the teaching of your church, that naturally arises out of the late election for Meath, and which now forces itself upon our notice.

It is not my intention to trouble you on the political view of the late election. Your own reflection, now that the heat of the contest is over, may lead you to doubt whether your victory be worth what it has cost.

It is true, the county of Meath is made for the present a close borough, to which you can nominate whom you please, however flagrantly your nominee may misrepresent the feelings of the county. Yet even such a power may be purchased too dearly.

If you reflect upon the feelings you have called forth in the minds of all the leading Roman Catholics of this county—Prestons, Barnewalls, Husseys, Farrells, Cruises, Plunketts, Delany's, and a whole host of respectable Roman Catholic electors of the middle class—you may well say, “One more such victory, and I shall be undone!”

If you consider the lesson you have given to Protestants, that no services rendered to your church and cause can secure the gratitude of yourself and your clergy,

if you consider how you have divorced the cause of your church from all association with the names that shed a lustre upon Irish history,

if you consider what a wound you have inflicted upon the just national feelings of Irishmen in your selection of a nominee to be forced upon this county,

if you consider the effect which the conduct of yourself and your brethren for the last two years has had upon English Roman Catholics, in making the Emancipation Act a nullity in England, Scotland and Wales (from all which but one Roman Catholic has been returned), thus depriving them of their fair and just share in the representation of the country,

if, I say, you consider all this, in a time of solemn reflection, you may well doubt whether you have not paid too high a price for the privilege of returning, as member for Meath, a man who will be a mere cypher in parliament, powerless to redress the real grievances of the country, because no possible British minister will dare to accept his support—powerless to advance even the interests of your church, because his very presence in parliament will be the most fatal argument against it.

If you had witnessed the scenes that passed in Kells at this election—if you had seen the filthy and disgusting insults to which all respectable Roman Catholic voters were subjected—if you had seen the filthy treatment bestowed at his own door, on that Roman Catholic in Kells whose charity and exertions for our poor have been most admirable (Mr. Flood's political opinions and mine are sufficiently different to make this just testimony to his worth above all suspicion)—you would tremble to think how nearly the violation of political gratitude is connected with the extinction of all private gratitude, all social virtue, all sense of civil liberty, everything that makes a people worthy of respect or admiration.

If you had seen your priests, some acting as check clerks in public polling booths, some like constables or bailiffs in the streets, seizing by the collar Roman Catholic voters at the door of the tally room which they wished to enter, and dragging them with violence through the street to the tally room which they wished

to avoid, you would trouble to think how you had lessened the respect of the people for a sacred character and calling.

Or if you could now hear how every respectable Roman Catholic in Kells expresses his deep disgust at such doings, and such scenes, you would fear lest this desperate effort to over-ride everything good and honourable in the feelings of your own people, may not prove the last fatal blow to your political power. Be assured, Right Reverend Sir, that multitudes are now inquiring whether religious liberty can be really supported by a system of civil tyranny in the hands of spiritual men; multitudes are now inquiring why politics should not be left to the laity; and many Roman Catholics are considering whether the clergy of all persuasions should not be restrained by law from taking part in elections, except only by giving their own votes. It is not for me to interfere with the consideration which Roman Catholics around me are giving to this subject, except by venturing to offer the willing consent and support of the clergy of my own Church to such a law, as it may apply to ourselves.

But the political view of this election is not the chief subject of my present address to you. I had no political interest in this election. I gave my vote, against my own political feelings, only to manifest my sympathy with those independent Roman Catholic electors whose conduct commands the sympathy and respect of all honourable men.

The question arising out of this election, on which I now require you either to speak or to be silent, is the teaching of your church upon political obligations—the teaching of your church upon solemn oaths—whether you use them as instruments of fraud, or as pledges of integrity! whether you teach men to violate them or to observe them?

It is a question which it behoves the people of this empire to understand; it is a question which must mainly influence the now wavering judgment of your own people upon the merits of the teaching of your church; it is a question upon which your speaking or your silence will be equally instructive.

Let me now show you how this question arises.

There was an electioneering meeting held in Kells, on Sunday, June 13, to give Mr. Lucas an opportunity of stating the principles on which he sought to be member for Meath.

Mr. Lucas was introduced to the meeting by the Rev. N. M'Evoy (your representative in Kells) as "the tried and trusted advocate of every principle dear to the hearts of the entire prelacy and priesthood of the land." If the keeping of oaths was a principle dear to the prelacy and priesthood, of course Mr. Lucas would be an advocate of that principle. Mr. M'Evoy said further—"Let them but send to parliament fifty or even forty members pledged to oppose any and every government that will not make tenant right and the abolition of the Church establishment cabinet questions."

When Mr. Lucas spoke, he said "the next thing Father M'Evoy drew my attention to is the subject of the Established Church." By the blessing of God in heaven, I will never rest nor cease my exertions, as long as I am in any position to exercise any public functions whatever, until that accursed monopoly, the Established Church, be cut down by the root." And how this was to be done he explains further on; when speaking still of the same subject he says—"We must try to put your discontent into the form of an act of parliament; at least we will have a good fight for it."

There is no mistake, Sir, about this, for it was published by Mr. Lucas himself, in his own paper, the *Tablet*, of June 21st. And you will not deny that Mr. Lucas goes to parliament, as member for Meath, pledged to use his vote and influence as a member of parliament, for the total overthrow of the Established Church; and that this is one of the chief grounds upon which you and your priests have returned him. Of course, sir, you read the *Tablet*, and so you were well aware of all this. Your priests were well aware of this too, for I believe more than twenty of them were present and heard it; and one of them, the Rev. Mr. Kelly, of Kilsire, in speaking after Mr. Lucas, said "he believed, in his inmost soul, in the sincerity of his (Mr. Lucas's) promises, and his ability to carry them out." You yourself wrote a letter to Mr. Lucas two days after that speech was delivered (which letter is also published in the *Tablet* of June 21), in which you thus state your directions to your priests, "after maturely weighing the talents, honesty, and efficacy of the various candidates, It is I conceive the duty of the clergy to explain their views to the electors of their respective parishes" &c., and you express your own "cordial concurrence" in their choice of Mr. Lucas. It is, therefore, clear that you and they have chosen Mr. Lucas as member for Meath upon this, as one of the chief grounds of your choice, that he is prepared to vote in parliament for an act for the total abolition of the Irish Church establishment, and for the confiscation of its property; and so far from denying this, you and others will perhaps wonder why I take so much pains to prove so plain a fact.

New mark what follows; you send him to parliament, with the declared object of doing this.

What is the next step?

On the first day on which Mr. Lucas presents himself to sit in the House of Commons, he is to take the oath on condition of which the Emancipation Act admits Roman Catholics to parliament, of which the following is a part—

"I do swear that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this realm as established by the laws; and I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and abjure any intention to subvert the present church establishment as settled by law within this realm: and I do solemnly swear, that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the United Kingdom; and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever; so HELP ME GOD."

"By the blessing of God in heaven (says Mr. Lucas in Kells) I will never rest nor cease my exertions until the Established Church be cut down by the root, and we must put this in the form of an act of parliament."

"I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and abjure any intention to subvert the present church establishment, as settled by law within this realm—so HELP ME GOD." So swears Mr. Lucas in parliament.

What follows next? Which is Mr. Lucas to keep—his promise to the priests in Meath, or his oath to God in parliament?

This, Right Reverend Sir, is the question which I put to you. Mr. Lucas's conscience is in the direction of you and your priests. You and your priests obtained this promise from him. You and your priests send him to parliament to take this oath. It rests with you, his spiritual guides, either to reconcile the promise and the oath, or to instruct him which he is to keep and which to violate.

What direction will you give him in the matter?

In a religious point of view the question you have to decide is no light one. "We who worship the one true and living God, to whom all things are known, who can neither deceive nor be deceived; when we call him to witness the things which we assert or promise, with what zeal, with what religion, with what care ought we to look to it, that the oath which we give shall be holy and inviolable?" It is no light thing before God to make such an oath an instrument of fraud and deceit.

In a political point of view your decision on this question will also be of great importance; it is no light thing to disclose to your fellow-subjects in this empire, that no oath which you and your representatives can take, can be any security for your good faith in what you swear.

You are also aware that an inquiry is pending into the doctrines which are taught to the Irish priests at Maynooth. You are aware that the books out of which they are taught in that college contain direct authorities for violating such oaths. You are aware that the defence which will be made for the college is this, that although this doctrine is contained in those books, yet the priests who are instructed out of those books do not adopt or practise this doctrine of violating oaths, or do not apply it to the oath in question. But if it should appear that the bishop and the priests of a whole diocese do sanction Mr. Lucas in violating this oath, and not only that, but send him to parliament pledged to them to violate it, what will this defence avail?

I enter on this subject with reluctance. You are aware that many Protestants consider the violation of oaths made to heretics to be a systematic part of the Roman religion. I have never treated it as such. I know indeed how far it is authorized in the books which are of greatest authority in your church. I know that it is the law of your church that such oaths are to be violated. All this I know well. But I never could think of charging such a wicked doctrine on Roman Catholics in general, because I know many Roman Catholics who would scorn to adopt such a doctrine, even on the authority of their church. I cannot forget that Lord Fingal, Lord Arundel, and many other Roman Catholics, have declared that this oath is binding on their conscience, and have acted accordingly. Among the upper and middle class of Roman Catholic electors in Meath, I am convinced that the great majority will be horrified at the thought of Mr. Lucas taking this oath falsely under the sanction of yourself and your priests.

Out of respect for them, I have heretofore avoided even discussing this subject. But I can do so no longer. You and your priests are, in fact, in sending Mr. Lucas to parliament, pledged to violate this oath; we are therefore forced to inquire whether you will now direct him to abandon this pledge or to violate this oath. We are forced to inquire whether it be indeed the doctrine of the Roman Catholic bishops and priests in Ireland, that solemn oaths taken to those whom you call heretics are to be violated. If it shall appear that you do indeed adopt and sanction such a principle, it will be of prac-

tical importance to know it, for although nine-tenths of the Roman Catholics of Ireland will honestly disavow such a doctrine, yet you have showed us that you and your priests may yet be able to choose as representatives those few Roman Catholics who are willing to submit their consciences to the direction of priests in this matter.

What, then, are the directions which you are prepared to give to Mr. Lucas? Will you tell him that his pledge is impossible to be kept, and that he must abandon it? Or will you instruct him that it is lawful for him to swear that he has no intention of subverting the Established Church, in order that by taking that oath he may get into a position to subvert it with effect?

If you answer that you cannot and will not give so wicked an advice, I am ready to accept your answer with confidence, and will look for the result with interest in Mr. Lucas's conduct.

If you do not give this open answer (and any other open answer you surely will not venture to give), I can only gather your secret intentions to Mr. Lucas from the public law of your church.

I find it thus laid down in the canon law of the Church of Rome—"An oath taken contrary to the interests of the church does not bind;" and the reason is thus stated—"because those which are attempted contrary to the interests of the church, are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries."—Decret. Greg. ix. liber ii. Tit. 24. ch. 27. Of course it is the interest of the Church of Rome that is here meant. And you would probably consider it contrary to the interest of the Church of Rome, that Roman Catholic members should swear in parliament that they will not subvert the present Church establishment. So you have the highest authority, even the law of your church, for saying that this oath does not bind.

But what is to be done with a person who takes an oath, knowing that the thing which he swears is unlawful? The canon law seems to answer this too—"Jurans scienter illicitum, non indiget absolutione, sed tenetur illud non observare;" "he who knowingly swears an unlawful thing, does not lack absolution, but is bound not to observe it."—Chap. 18, same title. I suppose this cannot mean that taking an unlawful oath does not need or require absolution, but rather that the person who takes such an oath is not to be left without absolution, but is to be absolved, provided he promise not to be bound by the oath. Thus, although you consider the oath unlawful in itself, yet if Mr. Lucas knowingly takes such an oath, you are to give him absolution, provided he will break it.

This, sir, appears to be the law of your church upon the subject, and when you send a man to parliament publicly pledged to violate the oath which he is to take there, we must presume, unless you disavow it, that you are prepared to act upon this law.

Let me here remind you that the question is not what is to be done by a man who has taken an unlawful oath, believing it to be lawful. There may be some very few cases, in which such an oath ought not to be kept, when a man discovers that that oath which he believed to be lawful and which he intended to keep at the time he took it, is indeed unlawful. But this is not Mr. Lucas's case. He has not taken the oath yet. He has time enough to consider, and you have time enough to instruct him, whether the oath is lawful or unlawful. If the oath be unlawful, or contrary to the interest of your church, then your own canon law says it is a perjury to take it; but if it be lawful, then, when taken, it would be a perjury to break it. The question is, will you sanction his taking a wicked oath, an oath which your own law says it is a perjury to take—will you sanction his doing this as a means of deceiving heretics, and violating the solemn conditions of the Emancipation Act, or will you sanction his breaking a lawful oath?

If you will not do either the one or the other, I submit that you must instruct him that the pledge which he gave at the meeting at Kells is unlawful and cannot be kept.

If you should give him no direction on the subject, I submit that you are answerable for the sin of allowing him to keep his pledge and violate his oath.

If you should be silent on the subject, it must be supposed that you will not condemn this use of oaths, while you cannot defend it. In that case Roman Catholics may be led to doubt how far they can trust in the religious teaching of those who cannot venture to avow and defend their doctrine on the plainest moral obligations.

I trust you will not suppose that I put forward this subject of the oath, to turn away discussion from the merits of the Irish Church. You will remember that three years ago, in a published correspondence which I had with the Rev. Mr. Kelly, of Kells, I invited him to discuss with me which church was descended from St. Patrick—which is entitled to the allegiance of the Catholic people of Ireland. The Rev. Mr. Kelly did answer that letter; but on this subject he was silent. I wrote another letter, which I sent to you, in which I invited any priest in your diocese to discuss this subject. No one has since ventured to do so. I still invite you to nominate any of your priests to discuss with me the merits of the Irish Church in the way I then proposed. Until you answer this, you cannot suppose that I wish

to avoid discussion on the subject in parliament or anywhere else.

But the subject of this letter is to call on you to declare the doctrine of your church on oaths, and political obligations—to say whether you consider it lawful to take an oath against the interest of your church (*the taking of which your own law pronounces to be perjury*), with no intention of keeping that oath, but taking it solely as a means of deceiving others.

And let me again remind you of the awful position in which Mr. Lucas stands—pledged to you and to your clergy to do this, and sent by you and your clergy to parliament to do it.

Surely, if ever a bishop was called on to direct any man's conscience, you are called on to direct Mr. Lucas in this.

I have the honour to be, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient servant,

EDWARD A. STOPFORD,
Archdeacon of Meath.

The foregoing letter was probably written before the following was published, which we take from Mr. Lucas's speech at the declaration of the members at the Meath election, as published in the *Tablet*, July 31, page 494, col. 2, which we add here, as it shows Mr. Lucas's own understanding of the grounds on which he is sent to parliament—"If we remain true to the principles on which we have been sent into parliament—if we keep to the principles of Sharman Crawford's Bill, *hostility to the Established Church, AND THE ABOLITION* of that odious monopoly," &c., &c. This puts the view taken in the foregoing letter, of Mr. Lucas's position, beyond all question.

Correspondence.

IS THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY TAUGHT BY THE HOLY FATHERS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In my letter on the above subject, which appears in your publication of this month, I did not, as you are pleased to represent, quote the Book of Maccabees as Scripture, but as an authentic *historical testimony* depositing to a fact which cannot be denied, that the practice of praying for the dead was the same among the ancient Jews as among the early Christians and Roman Catholics of the present day (read fourth paragraph of my letter).

I did not state the Book of Maccabees was any portion of the public worship of the Jews, or that they ever acknowledged that book as Scripture, given by inspiration of God; but I boldly affirmed that *prayers for the dead* formed part and parcel of the public worship of the Jews; and I now reiterate my inquiry, why such a practice did not meet the censure and condemnation of Christ and his Apostles?

That is the question to which I expect a direct answer, and not whether the Book of Maccabees be apocryphal or otherwise.

With respect to your observations on my quotations from some of the Fathers of the three and four first centuries, I leave your readers to exercise their private judgment and arrive at their own conclusions. I just beg, however, to observe, that you take no notice whatever of some of the early Fathers declaring the practice of praying for the dead to be of APOSTOLICAL TRADITION. St. Chrysostom is decisive on the point (*Homil. 3, in Epist. ad Philip.*), and (*in Homil. 21*) states the solemn usage to have been ordained by the DIVINE SPIRIT. WARNER CHRISTIAN SEARCH.

July, 1852.

On the above letter we wish to say, in the first place, that it is our most earnest desire to do the fullest justice, and to act with perfect candour towards those who enter into discussion in our pages. Above all, we desire never to misrepresent their arguments. We should be unworthy of their contributions if we did. We are liable to mistake the point of an argument unintentionally; and, in such a case, we shall always be ready to acknowledge and correct our error, and thankful for the opportunity of doing so.

In this instance, we have mistaken "W. C. Search's" argument from the Book of Maccabees; and he has given us the opportunity of answering more to the point; and we gladly avail ourselves of it.

The argument is this—"Although we should regard the second Book of Maccabees merely as an account, written by an uninspired historian of fair character and credit, even in that view it is a sufficient testimony that the Jews did actually practise prayers and sacrifice for the repose of departed souls, just as the Roman Catholic Church does now; and that this was part of the public worship of the Jewish Church in our Saviour's time; and, since he did not reprove the Jews for this, his silence must be taken as admitting it to be right." We trust that "W. C. Search" will think the

above a candid statement of his argument; and we acknowledge it deserves a better answer than we have yet given it. And we now offer the following answer—

We agree to take the writer of this book as a historian worthy of that credit which is given to historians of fair character; but we do not acknowledge him to be infallible through Divine inspiration, and "W. C. Search" does not require us to admit this.

Before we can rely on this writer's "historical testimony," we must know exactly what his testimony is. We cannot be bound by an erroneous translation; the writer wrote in Greek, and we must look to the Greek, which he wrote, to learn his testimony with accuracy.

We look anxiously for the most authentic copy of the Greek, and we have no hesitation in adopting, for this purpose, an ancient manuscript, belonging to the Pope, which is carefully preserved, in the Pope's library in the Vatican. This book is, at least, 1,200 years old, if not more. There is no copy that can compare with it in point of authority, except the Alexandrian Manuscript, now in the British Museum; and the two copies agree in the place in question, and every other Greek copy of Maccabees agrees with them too; so we have no room to doubt what the writer did really write in the Greek. And we are able to make use of that valuable manuscript in the Pope's library, because an exact copy of it was printed in the year 1587, by the authority of Pope Sixtus the Fifth.

We now give an exact translation from the Greek as then published by Pope Sixtus; and we place beside it the translation in the Douay Bible, that our readers may compare the two. 2 Macc. xii. 43, &c. :—

DOUAY TRANSLATION.

43. And making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem, for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection.

44. (For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.)

45. And because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness had great grace laid up for them.

46. It is, therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins.

We have printed in Italics the places in which the difference is important; and we give here the corresponding Greek words, that those learned in that language may satisfy themselves which translation is correct. In v. 43, the Greek words are, Προσαγαγειν περι αμαρτιας θνητων. In v. 46, οσια και ενσους η επινοια. οθεν περι των τεθνηκοτων τον εξιλασμον ποιησατο, της αμαρτιας απολυθηται. We appeal to all Greek scholars if we have not translated this correctly.

Observe, now, in v. 43, the historian does not say in the Greek (what the Douay version is thought to say) that Judas Maccabeus offered the sacrifice for the benefit of the dead. He says nothing of the dead; he only says, that it was offered on account of sin.

Observe, next, in v. 46, what the writer says about a holy and pious thought is not spoken of what follows (as the Douay translation makes it appear), but of what goes before. Every Greek scholar will see that it is impossible to connect these words in the Greek with what follows. It was the belief in a reward for those who die the death of the righteous, that the author of this book called a holy and pious thought.

Observe, lastly, that the Douay Bible, in v. 46, again applies the benefit to the dead—"to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins." But the writer in the Greek does not say so. He does not say that the dead might be loosed; he does not say who were to be loosed, but he says that Judas made an atonement concerning, or on account of, the dead; he does not say for the dead, for then he would have written υπερ, whereas he has written περι, concerning the dead; and he does not say that they should be loosed, but "to be loosed," which might be for Judas himself, and for others, if living: for if the sins of the dead had brought the living under sin, an atonement would be required for the living, because of the dead.

We observe here that "W. C. Search" has argued only from v. 43 & 46; he has not referred to v. 44. We therefore, answer here only from the verses he relies on, and we will consider v. 44 separately.

From verses 43 and 46, rightly translated, our answer is clear. The sacrifice was offered, and the atonement was made, not for the dead, but for the living.

It is a fact that, according to the law of Moses, the sin of those who were slain had brought guilt upon the whole nation of the living, which required to be atoned for by sacrifice, according to the Jewish law.

We have a clear instance of such a case in the Book of Joshua, ch. 7, v. 1—"But the children of Israel transgressed the commandment, and took to their own use of the anathema. For Achan, the son of Charmi, &c., took something of the anathema, and the Lord was angry against the children of Israel." Here observe that one man only committed the sin, and it was unknown to the rest, for he hid the thing in the ground (v. 21), and yet it brought God's anger on the whole people.

Now, the sin on account of which Judas Maccabeus offered sacrifice, was exactly of the same kind. "They found under the coats of the slain some of the donaries of the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbiddeth to the Jews."—2 Macc. xii. 40. This was the anathema, or accursed thing, which they, like Achan, had taken; and in the same way it brought God's anger on the nation.

And the punishment was like in both cases. In Achan's case, the people, after a succession of victories, in which none of them were killed, were put to flight before their enemies, and many of them killed, because of what Achan had done. Just so Judas Maccabeus, after many victories, met with a check, and some of his soldiers were killed: and when they came to bury them, they found the reason, that they had taken of the cursed thing.

There was this difference in the two cases—In Achan's case, the guilty man was not killed. The atonement consisted in putting him to death, by God's command; but there was sacrifice too, for all his sheep and oxen were burned—Joshua vii. 24, 25, 26. But in the case before us, the idolaters were slain. Judas, therefore, could not make atonement for the guilt that had been brought upon the nation, by putting them to death; and it was his duty to look to the law of Moses and see what atonement was directed for such a case. This he would find exactly prescribed in the Book of Leviticus, chapter iv., from verse 13 to 31 inclusive. In those circumstances it was the duty of Judas Maccabeus to have such a sacrifice offered at Jerusalem, not for the benefit of the dead, but that the living might be delivered from the sin or guilt which the wickedness of the slain had brought upon the whole people. And on looking back to the correct translation which we have given of verses 43 and 46, it will be seen that every word is exactly suitable to such a sacrifice: for instance, when Judas provided the sacrifice, by a "collection made man by man," it was evidently that each of the people should contribute to the atonement, which was made for the people as a whole: if the sacrifice had been for the benefit of the dead, it would have been enough to collect from those who desired to give.

This is the true account of what is related in those two verses, because this is what Judas was bound to do, according to the law of Moses, which was the only rule that it was lawful for him to follow in that matter. "W. C. Search" will, no doubt, acknowledge that Jews were strictly bound by the law of Moses, both as to the manner of offering sacrifice and the purpose for which it was to be offered; excepting only in the case of persons inspired and directed by God, which no one supposes was the case with Judas.

Now, we have shown that, according to that law, it was his duty to offer that sacrifice for the living; and we have shown that the two verses on which "W. C. Search" relies, when rightly translated, are most appropriate to that sacrifice which the law required for the living, and that those verses do not say it was for the dead. Now, can "W. C. Search" show us, from the law of Moses, that it was Judas's duty to offer sacrifice for the dead? We urge this upon him. If he cannot (and we know he cannot) will he not agree with us that Judas offered his sacrifice according to the law, and not contrary to the law, seeing that Judas was bound by that law, and was a most strict observer of it?

We have now given a full answer, as respects those two verses which "W. C. S." argues from. We will now go on and consider v. 44, which he has not introduced into his argument.

"W. C. Search" has laid it down most plainly that, for the purpose of this discussion, the writer of that book is to be considered as an uninspired historian of fair character and credit. As such we consider him. It is a rule in judging of all such historians, that a great difference is to be made between the facts which the historian relates and his own reflections upon those facts. The one may be most correct, the other most erroneous. The difference is greater still between the actions which the historian records, and the historian's guess, for it can be little more than a guess, at the secret thoughts which led the actor to do what he did. "W. C. Search" must surely have observed the importance of this distinction, in reading even historians of the highest character and credit.

The highest praise an historian can obtain is, that he keeps the facts which he records distinct from his own reflections on those facts—that he does not allow his own reflections to influence the account of the facts.